

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

9

10

11

12 K.A., Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:24-CV-04786-WLH-ADS

13 v.

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
VISA'S OMNIBUS MOTION TO
DISMISS**

14
15
16 MINDGEEK S.A.R.L.; MG
17 FREESITES, LTD; MINDGEEK USA
18 INCORPORATED; MG PREMIUM
19 LTD.; MG GLOBAL
20 ENTERTAINMENT INC.; 9219-1568
21 Quebec, Inc.; BERND BERGMAIR;
22 FERAS ANTOON; DAVID TASSILLO;
23 COREY URMAN; VISA INC.;
24 REDWOOD CAPITAL
25 MANAGEMENT, LLC ; REDWOOD
26 DOE FUNDS 1-7 ; COLBECK
27 CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC;
28 COLBECK DOE FUNDS 1-3,

Date: January 31, 2025

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Judicial Officer: Wesley L. Hsu

Courtroom: 9B

Defendants.

1 Defendant Visa, Inc.’s Omnibus Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a
2 Claim (“Visa’s Omnibus Motion to Dismiss”) came before this Court for hearing on
3 January 31, 2025. Visa argued that the claims against it should be dismissed because
4 (i) the Complaints did not state a claim for relief against Visa under the Trafficking
5 Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (“TVPRA”), 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a)(2) or any
6 other secondary liability theory (Count II); (ii) the Complaints did not plausibly
7 allege any conspiracy claim against Visa (Counts IV & XVII); (iii) the Complaints
8 did not plausibly allege any claims for relief under California state law (Count XIV);
9 (iv) the Complaints did not plausibly allege any intentional infliction of emotional
10 distress claim against Visa (Count XVI); and that (v) dismissal with prejudice was
11 warranted because any amendment would be futile. Having considered the papers
12 and arguments of counsel submitted in connection with Visa’s Omnibus Motion to
13 Dismiss, and finding good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

14 Visa’s Omnibus Motion to Dismiss Counts II, IV, XIV, XVI, and XVII for
15 failure to state a claim is GRANTED for the following cases:

16 *K.A. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-04786-WLH-ADS (C.D.
17 Cal. June 7, 2024); *L.T. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-04791-WLH-
18 ADS (C.D. Cal. June 7, 2024); *N.L. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-
19 04788-WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 7, 2024); *N.Y. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case
20 No. 2:24-cv-04801-WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 7, 2024); *T.C. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case
21 No. 2:24-cv-04795-WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 7, 2024); *X.N. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case
22 No. 2:24-cv-04800-WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 7, 2024); *J.C. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-04971-WLH-ADS (C.D.
23 Cal. June 12, 2024); *C.S. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-04992-
24 WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 13, 2024); *S.O. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No.
25 2:24-cv-04998-WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 13, 2024); *W.L. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No.
26 2:24-cv-04977-WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 13, 2024); *L.S. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-05026-WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 14,

1 2024); *A.K. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-05190-WLH-ADS (C.D.
2 Cal. June 20, 2024); *W.P. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-05185-
3 WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. June 20, 2024); and *J.L. v. MindGeek, S.à.r.l., et al.*, Case
4 No. 2:24-cv-7046-WLH-ADS (C.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2024); and

5 Plaintiffs' claims against Visa in their Complaints are DISMISSED WITH
6 PREJUDICE.

7

8

9

Dated: _____

HONORABLE WESLEY L. HSU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28